arXiv:1701.08949v1 [math.RA] 31 Jan 2017

ON SUPERNILPOTENT ALGEBRAS

ALEXANDER WIRES

Abstract. We establish a characterization of supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras which generalizes the affine structure of abelian Mal'cev algebras and the recent characterization of 3-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras. We then show that for varieties in which the two-generated free algebra is finite: (1) neutrality of the higher commutators is equivalent to congruence meet-semidistributivity, and (2) the class of varieties which interpret a Mal'cev term in every supernilpotent algebra is equivalent to the existence of a weak difference term.

1. Introduction

The notion of centralizing elements and centralizing subgroups plays a fundamental role in the structure theory of groups, both finite and infinite. One of the most successful approaches in extending aspects of these ideas to more general algebraic systems has been the generalization of the commutator as a binary operation on congruence lattices of algebras. The commutator theory for congruence permutable varieties developed by J.D.H Smith [15], and latter extended to congruence modular varieties in Herrmann [9], Hagemann and Herrmann [8] and Gumm [7], satisfies many of the same useful properties as the traditional commutator when specialized to normal subgroups in the theory of groups. In the setting of congruence modular varieties, the commutator has become a powerful tool in understanding the structure of these algebras.

The commutator, also known as the term-condition commutator, can be defined for arbitary algebras, and while it is no longer as well-behaved as in the congruence modular setting, it has proven instrumental in numerous advances; for just two examples, in the classification of finite algebras by tame congruence theory [6] and then in the extensions of many of these results to an infinite setting in Kearnes and Szendrei [10] and Kearnes and Kiss [11]. This introduction can in now way give an accurate account and due recognition to all the contributors to the general commutator theory - please consult Freese and McKenzie [5].

Underlying many of the most impressive applications of the commutator for general algebras is the fact that it is defined by a certain centralizer relation universally quantified over the polynomials of an algebra which in principle carries information about the identities and behavior of the term operations in relation to particular elements. A fundamental example of this is illustrated by the result in [9] which establishes the affine structure of

Date: January 30, 2017.

polynomials of an abelian algebra in a congruence modular variety; that is, an algebra in a congruence modular variety is abelian if and only if it is polynomially equivalent to an abelian group with a ring of operators.

The higher commutators defined by Bulatov [3] were introduced as a tool to help differentiate between distinct Mal'cev clones on a finite set. Like the binary term-condition commutator, it is also defined for arbitrary algebras by a centralizer relation which in general satisfies many, but not all of the properties of the binary instance; however, in Aichinger and Mudrinski [1] we find that in congruence permutable varieties many of the properties that made the binary commutator such a useful tool continue to hold for the higher commutators. The 3-supernipotent Mal'cev algebras (abelian in the sense of the ternary commutator) are characterized in Mudrinski [13] as polynomially equivalent to groups with a special family of unary and binary operators. This is a proper generalization of the affine structure of abelian Mal'cev algebras from [9]. In Opršal [14], the higher commutators for Mal'cev algebras are encoded by a certain subpower with application to supernilpotent clones. Recently, in Moorhead [12] some of the fundamental properties of the higher commutator for congruence permutable varieties are extended to the congruence modular setting.

The purpose of the present article is to provide a characterization of supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras which generalizes the affine structure of abelian Mal'cev algebras and the special class of expanded groups described in [13]. The argument utilizes two principle ideas: the use of absorbing polynomials to mimic aspects of the commutator calculus in groups and the representation of arbitrary polynomials in loops by absorbing polynomials. In [1], we learn the utility of absorbing polynomials in proving many of the higher commutator properties in Mal'cev algebras; in particular, absorbing polynomials provide a convenient generating set of the higher commutators of congruences [1, Lem.6.9]. In [13], we see how absorbing polynomials are used to represent the polynomials of certain expanded groups and determine "distributivity" of smaller arity absorbing polynomials.

For an arbitrary variety, congruence semidistributivity is equivalent to the neutrality of the binary term-condition commutator. The conjecture is that for congruence semidistributive varieties, all the higher commutators are also neutral. This is only proven under the assumption that the two-generated free algebra is finite (Theorem 4.5). Under this finiteness assumption, we also show the the class of varieties in which the supernilpotent algebras are polynomially equivalent to n-type loops (defined in Section 3) is equivalent to the class of varieties with a weak difference term.

In section 2, we state the definitions and properties of the higher centralizer and commutator. We also record the characterizations of 3-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras from [13]. In section 3, we state and prove Theorem 3.8 which is the characterization of arbitrary supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras. We also show how to derive the characterizations for abelian and 3-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras from Theorem 3.8. Section 4 contains the results related to congruence meet-semidistributivity and varieties with a weak difference term.

2. All and Sundry

We record some facts which we will require in the next section. The definitions and notations for algebras are standard and can be found in [2] and [4]. For definitions and notation concerning the commutator consult [5].

The natural numbers are $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ so 0 is not included (I apologize to half the readers). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $[n]^{(k)} = \{s \subseteq [n] : |s| = k\}$. A partition of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sum $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_k$ with $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$; in particular, each $n_i \geq 1$. Given a map $f : A^n \to A$ and $a \in A$, we write $f = \hat{a}$ to mean f is the constant map which maps A^n to a.

We sometimes use a convenient notation for evaluating operations on particular substitutions. Suppose we have an operation $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) : A^n \to A$ and a tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in A^m$. Then for any $C \subseteq [m]$ and tuple $(b_1, \ldots, b_{|C|}) \in A^{|C|}$, $f(a_1, \ldots, a_m)_C[b_1, \ldots, b_{|C|}]$ denotes the evaluation of f where the elements of $(b_1, \ldots, b_{|C|})$ are substituted in to the corresponding coordinates of $(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ specified C. For example, we have

$$f(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7)_{\{2,4,7\}}[5, 2, 1] = f(a_1, 5, a_3, 2, a_5, a_6, 1).$$

We will also sometimes write a term $t(\bar{x}_S)$ for a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ to specify that the variables in t are precisely x_i for $i \in S$.

A *quasigroup* is an algebra $\mathbf{A} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, / \rangle$ satisfying the identities

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x\backslash(x \cdot y) & \approx & y & (x \cdot y)/y \approx x \\ x \cdot (x\backslash y) & \approx & y & (x/y) \cdot y \approx x. \end{array}$$

In a quasigroup we always have the additional identities $(x/y)\backslash x = y = x/(y/x)$. A *loop* is a quasigroup which has a constant 0 satisfying $0 \cdot x \approx x \cdot 0 \approx 0$. In a loop, we have the additional identities

$$\begin{array}{rcll} 0\backslash x & \approx & x & x\backslash x \approx 0 \\ x/0 & \approx & x & x/x \approx 0. \end{array}$$

Note any quasigroup has a Mal'cev term given by $m(x, y, z) := (x/(y\backslash y)) \cdot (y\backslash z)$.

For a fixed variety $\mathcal{V}$ in the signature σ, we say $\mathbf{B} = \left\langle B, \sigma^B, F \right\rangle$ is an expanded $\mathcal{V}$-algebra if the reduct $\left\langle B, \sigma^B \right\rangle \in \mathcal{V}$ and F is a set of operations.

2.1. Nilpotent Mal'cev Algebras.

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra in a Mal'cev variety. If $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent, then $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to an expanded loop [5, Ch.7]. Let us describe in more detail how this is accomplished. Let $m(xyz)$ denote a Mal'cev term for $\mathbf{A}$ and suppose $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent of class n. Inductively define the lower central series by

$$(1]^0 = 1, \quad (1]^{n+1} = [1, (1]^n]$$

and sequence of terms f_n, g_n by

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x,y,z) &:= x \\ f_{n+1}(x,y,z) &:= m(y, m(y,x,m(f_n(x,y,z),y,z)), f_n(x,y,z)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(x,y,z) &:= z \\ g_{n+1}(x,y,z) &:= m(g_n(x,y,z), m(m(x,y,g_n(x,y,z)),z,y),y). \end{aligned}$$

The lower central series and the terms f_n, g_n are related in $\mathbf{A}$ in the following manner [5, Lem.7.3]: for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{array}{llllll} m(f_n(x,y,z),y,z) & (1]^n & x & (1]^n & m(z,y,g_n(z,y,x)) \\ f_n(m(x,y,z),y,z) & (1]^n & x & (1]^n & g_n(z,y,m(z,y,x)). \end{array}$$

Since A is nilpotent of class n, $(1]^n = 0_A$; thus, for all $b, c \in A$ the maps $x \mapsto m(x,b,c)$ and $x \mapsto f_n(x,b,c)$ are inverses of each other, and the maps $x \mapsto m(c,b,x)$ and $x \mapsto g_n(c,b,x)$ are inverses of each other. It also follows that

$$\begin{array}{llll} f_n(y,x,x) \approx y & & & g_n(x,x,y) \approx y \\ f_n(x,y,x) \approx y & & & g_n(x,y,x) \approx y \end{array}$$

in $\mathbf{A}$. We can now define the polynomial loop reduct. Fix an element $0 \in A$ and define

$$x \cdot y := m(x,0,y) \quad x \backslash y := g_n(x,0,y) \quad x/y := f_n(x,0,y).$$

Then A is polynomially equivalent to the loop $L_{\mathbf{A}} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, F \rangle$ where we gather the remaining operations into F. $L_{\mathbf{A}}$ is nilpotent of the same degree as $\mathbf{A}$. In the next section, we shall see how supernilpotence of $\mathbf{A}$ is related to characterizations of which operations can be used for F in order to generate $\operatorname{Pol}\mathbf{A}$.

2.2. **Higher Commutators.** Let us now recall the definition of the n-commutator defined by Bulatov [3].

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra, and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta \in \operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$. We say that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ centralizes β modulo δ, and write $\mathrm{C}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta; \delta)$ if for all polynomials $f(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{y})$ and vectors $\bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_n, \bar{c}, \bar{d}$ satisfying

(1) $\bar{a}_i \equiv_{\alpha_i} \bar{b}_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$,
(2) $\bar{c} \equiv_\beta \bar{d}$, and
(3) $f(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{c}) \equiv_\delta f(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{d})$ for every tuple $(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n) \in \{\bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1\} \times \cdots \times \{\bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_n\} \setminus \{(\bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n)\}$,

we have $f(\bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n, \bar{c}) \equiv_\delta f(\bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n, \bar{d})$.

In this case we write $\mathbf{A} \vDash \mathrm{C}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta; \delta)$. The following properties follow directly by application of the definition of the centralizer relation.

Lemma 2.2. We have the following properties of the centralizer relation in an agebra $\mathbf{A}$:

(1) $\mathbf{A} \vDash \bigwedge_{i\in I} C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta_t) \to C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \bigwedge_{t\in I} \delta_t)$
(2) If each $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$, then $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n; \delta) \to C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta)$.
(3) For any permutation $\sigma : [n-1] \to [n-1]$,

$$\mathbf{A} \vDash \mathrm{C}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n; \delta) \text{ iff } \mathbf{A} \vDash \mathrm{C}(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \alpha_{\sigma(n-1)}, \alpha_n; \delta).$$

(4) For $\gamma \leq \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n \wedge \delta$,

$$\mathbf{A} \vDash \mathrm{C}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta) \text{ iff } \mathbf{A}/\gamma \vDash \mathrm{C}(\alpha_1/\gamma, \ldots, \alpha_n/\gamma, \beta/\gamma; \delta/\gamma).$$

(5) For $i < n$, $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta) \to C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta)$.
(6) If $\alpha_n \wedge (\beta \circ (\delta \wedge \alpha_n) \circ \beta) \subseteq \delta$, then for $k < n$ we always have

$$\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1}, \beta, \alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta);$$

if in addition $\alpha_n \wedge (\gamma \circ (\delta \wedge \alpha_n) \circ \gamma) \subseteq \delta$, then we have

$$\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1}, \beta \vee \gamma, \alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta).$$

Property (1) in Lemma 2.2 yields the following definition.

Definition 2.3. For an algebra $\mathbf{A}$, we let $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n]$ be the smallest congruence δ such that $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \delta)$.

For any arbitrary algebra $\mathbf{A}$ we have the the following properties:
(HC1) $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \leq \bigwedge_{1\leq i\leq n} \alpha_i$;
(HC2) If each $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$, then $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \leq [\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n]$;
(HC3) $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \leq [\alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n]$.
If $\mathbf{A}$ generates a Mal'cev variety, then the following hold [1]:
(HC4) For any permutation $\sigma : [n] \to [n]$, $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] = [\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \alpha_{\sigma(n-1)}]$;
(HC5) $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \leq \eta$ if and only if $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n; \eta)$;
(HC6) If $\eta \leq \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n$, then in $\mathbf{A}/\eta$ we have

$$[\alpha_1/\eta, \ldots, \alpha_n/\eta] = ([\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \vee \eta)/\eta;$$

(HC7) For any $j \in [n]$ and collection $\{\beta_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq \operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$,

$$[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}, \bigvee_{i\in I} \beta_i, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n] = \bigvee_{i\in I} [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}, \beta_i, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n];$$

(HC8) For any $1 < i < n$, $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, [\alpha_i, \ldots, \alpha_n]] \leq [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n]$.

A congruence $\alpha \in \operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$ is *n-supernilpotent* if $\underbrace{[\alpha, \ldots, \alpha]}_{n} = 0_A$. The algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is said to be n-supernilpotent if 1_A is. The terminology is justified by the following observation: if $\mathbf{A}$ generates a Mal'cev variety, then by repeated applications of (HC8) for any $\alpha \in \operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$ we have

$$\underbrace{[\alpha, \ldots, \alpha]}_{n} \geq [\alpha, \underbrace{[\alpha, \ldots, \alpha]}_{n-1}] \geq [\alpha, [\alpha, \underbrace{[\alpha, \ldots, \alpha]}_{n-2}]] \geq \cdots \geq [\alpha, [\cdots [\alpha, \alpha]].$$

with n-1 nested binary commutators in the last term. So if $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent, then $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent of class n-1.

The characterization of 3-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras we wish to generalize is the following:

Theorem 2.4. ([13]) Suppose $\mathbf{A}$ generates a Mal'cev variety. The following are equivalent:

(1) $\mathbf{A}$ is 3-supernilpotent ($[1_A, 1_A, 1_A] = 0_A$).
(2) $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to an expanded group $\mathbf{V} = \langle A, +, -, 0, F\rangle$ such that
   (a) F is the set of at most binary absorbing operations on $\mathbf{V}$,
   (b) Every absorbing binary polynomial is distributive with respect to $+$ in both arguments, and
   (c) $\mathbf{V}$ is 2-nilpotent ($[1_V, [1_V, 1_V]] = 0_V$).

3. Supernilpotent Mal'cev Algebras

Definition 3.1. [1] Let $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathrm{Pol}_n \mathbf{A}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n, a \in A$. We say f absorbs $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ to a if $f(b_1, \dots, b_n) = a$ whenever some $b_i = a_i$.

If $a \in A$, we say $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a-absorbing if f absorbs $(a, \dots, a)$ to a. Let $\mathrm{Ab}_a^k \mathbf{A}$ denote the set of k-ary a-absorbing polynomials of $\mathbf{A}$.

Absorbing polynomials interact with the commutator operation on the congruence lattice in ways which mimic the behavior of the commutator term $[x, y] := xyx^{-1}y^{-1}$ in relation to a normal series in a group $\mathbf{G}$. Note $[x, y] \in \mathrm{Ab}_{\mathrm{id}}^2 \mathbf{G}$.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra. If $f \in \mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{A}$ absorbs $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ to a, then for any partition $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_k$ with $k \leq n$ and $\{\alpha_j^i : i \in [k], j \in [n_i]\} \subseteq \mathrm{Con}\, \mathbf{A}$ we have

$$f(a_1/[\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{n_1}^1], \dots, a_k/[\alpha_1^k, \dots, \alpha_{n_k}^k]) \subseteq a/\left[[\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{n_1}^1], \dots, [\alpha_1^k, \dots, \alpha_{n_k}^k]\right]$$

where we set $[\alpha] = \alpha$; consequently, if $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent, then $\mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A} = \{\hat{0}\}$ for $k \geq n$.

`Proof`: Let $b_i \in a_i/[\alpha_1^i, \dots, \alpha_{n_I}^1]$ for $i \in [k]$. Then for any tuple $\bar{u} \in \left\{\bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1\right\} \times \cdots \times \left\{\bar{a}_{k-1}, \bar{b}_{k-1}\right\} \setminus \left\{(\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{k-1})\right\}$ we see that $f(\bar{u}, a_k) = a = f(\bar{u}, b_k)$ since some coordinate of $\bar{u}$ must be an a_i. This yields

$$a = f(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, a_k)\left[[\alpha_1^1, \dots, \alpha_{n_1}^1], \dots, [\alpha_1^k, \dots, \alpha_{n_k}^k]\right] f(b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k).$$

Now assume $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent. Note $0/1_A = A$ and so for any $f \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A}$, we have $(f(b_1, \dots, b_k), 0) \in [\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k}] \leq [\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n}] = 0$ by the first part and (HC3). •

Definition 3.3. An expanded loop $\mathbf{A} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ is said to be *n-type* if

(1) F is the set of at most (n-1)-ary absorbing operations of $\mathbf{A}$;
(2) every $f \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^{n-1} \mathbf{A}$ is distributive over "$\cdot$" in each coordinate;

(3) $\operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$ satisfies $[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n-k},[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{k}]] = 0_A$ for each $2 \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

From condition (3) above, we see that an n-type loop must be nilpotent of class n-1 by repeated application of (HC8). The next two lemmas will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 3.4. Let $\mathbf{A} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ be a n-type expanded loop. Fix $k < n-1$. Suppose we have

- a parameter $1 \leq p \leq k$ with $a_{p+1}, \dots, a_k \in A$ and polynomials $g_i \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^{m_i} A$ with $m_i \geq n_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$.
- a partition $n-1 = n_1 + \cdots + n_k$ with $n_1 \geq 2$;
- $f \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A}$;

Then $f(g_1, \dots, g_p, a_{p+1}, \dots, a_k) = \hat{0}$.

`Proof`: By Definition 3.3(3) we have $[[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n-n_1},[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n_1}]] = 0$ since $n_1 \geq 2$. Repeated applications of (HC8) and (HC4) yields

$$[[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n_1}],\dots,[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n_k}]] = 0. \quad (*)$$

Lemma 3.2 implies each $(g_i, 0) \in [\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m_i}] \leq [\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n_i}]$. We always have $(a_i, 0) \in 1_A$ and $(h, 0) \in 1_A$ for any $a_i \in A, h \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$. Then another application of Lemma 3.2 and $(*)$ finishes the calculation. •

Lemma 3.5. Let $L = \mathbf{A} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ be a n-type expanded loop. If $f \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{L}$ with $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, then for any left-associated product $\prod_{i=1}^m y_i$ we have that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \prod_{i=1}^m y_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$$

is a product of absorbing polynomials in the x_i's and y_j's of arity p with $k \leq p \leq n-1$.

`Proof`: The proof is by descent from $n-1$ down to 1. By permuting the coordinates, it is enough to establish the lemma for the first coordinate. For the base case, take $g \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^{n-1} L$. By condition 3.3(2), g distributes over $\cdot$ so writing $\bar{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_{n-1})$ we have $g(\prod_{i=1}^m y_i, \bar{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^m g(y_i, \bar{x})$. Now assume the result for $k+1$. Take $f \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{L}$ and define

$$f'(y_1, y_2, x_2, \dots, x_k) := f(y_2, x_2, \dots, x_k) \backslash \left(f(y_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \backslash f(y_1 + y_2, x_2, \dots, x_k) \right).$$

Then $f' \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^{k+1}\mathbf{L}$. Solving for f we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\prod_{i=1}^{m} y_i, \bar{x}) &= f(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} y_i, \bar{x}) \left(f(y_m, \bar{x}) \cdot f'(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} y_i, y_m, \bar{x}) \right) \\ &= (\cdots((f(y_1, \bar{x}) \cdot s_2) \cdot s_3) \cdots) \cdot s_m \end{aligned}$$

where $s_j = f(y_j, \bar{x}) \cdot f'(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}, y_j, \bar{x})$. By the inductive hypothesis each $f'(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}, y_j, \bar{x})$ is a product of absorbing polynomials of arity p with $k+1 \leq p \leq n-1$; therefore, each s_j, and also $f(\prod_{i=1}^{m} y_i, \bar{x})$, is a product of absorbing polynomials of arity p with $k \leq p \leq n-1$. •

The next definition is meant to give a convenient generalization of when an algebra is polynomially equivalent to a module over a ring with unity.

Definition 3.6. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra. We say $\mathbf{A}$ has a *representation of degree n* if the there exists $0 \in A$ and a binary polynomial $x \cdot y := r(x, y) \in \mathrm{Pol}_2 \mathbf{A}$ such that every polynomial $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{A}$ can be written as a left-associated product

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \prod_{i=0}^{p} r_i = ((\cdots((c \cdot r_1) \cdot r_2) \cdots) \cdot r_{p-1}) \cdot r_p$$

where

(1) $r_0 = c \in A$;
(2) $p = \min\{k, n\}$;
(3) $0 \cdot x = x \cdot 0 = x$ for all $x \in A$;
(4) for $1 \leq m \leq p$, each $r_m = r_m(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ is a left-associated product

$$r_m(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \prod_{S \in [k]^{(m)}} t_S^m(\bar{x}_S)$$

where $t_S^m(\bar{x}_S) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{A}$.

Example 3.7. Let A be an abelian algebra with a Mal'cev term $m(x, y, z)$ and fix $0 \in \mathbf{A}$. Define $x + y := m(x, 0, y)$. For each $f \in \mathrm{Pol}_k A$, define

$$r_i(x) := m(f(0, \ldots, 0, x, 0, \ldots, 0), f(0, \ldots, 0), 0)$$

where x is in the i-th coordinate of f. Then $r_i \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$. Since A is an abelian Mal'cev algebra, one shows that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = f(0, \ldots, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i(x_i)$. So $\mathbf{A}$ has a representation of degree 1.

Let $R = \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$ and consider the operation $+$ induced on R. Then $+$ is commutative, associative and there is an additive inverse defined by $-x := m(0, x, 0)$. So $\langle R, +, -, 0 \rangle$ is an abelian group. If we define a multiplication on R by composition $\circ$, then $\mathbf{R} = \langle R, \circ, +, -, 0 \rangle$ is a ring with unity given by $\mathrm{id}(x)$.

If we define an action of R on A by $r * a = r(a)$ for $r \in R$, $a \in A$, then this determines a module representation of $\mathbf{R}$ which we denote by $\mathbf{M}_A$. The degree 1 representation proves $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to the $\mathbf{R}$-module $\mathbf{M}_A$ in which each $f \in \mathrm{Pol}_k A$ is represented as $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = c + \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i \cdot x_i$.

Since the binary operation is not associative in general, the order of the parentheses matter.

Theorem 3.8. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra in a Mal'cev variety. The following are equivalent:

(1) $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent;
(2) $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent and has a representation of degree n-1;
(3) $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to an n-type loop.

Proof: Let $m(x, y, z)$ be a Mal'cev term for $\mathbf{A}$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent. From the discussion in Section 2, $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent of class n-1 and $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to a loop $\mathbf{L}_A = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ which is also nilpotent of class n-1. We will establish the representation by a form of polynomial interpolation in $L_{\mathbf{A}}$. We take the loop multiplication "$\cdot$" as the basic binary product and note that condition 3.6(3) is immediately satisfied.

Take $f \in \mathrm{Pol}_m \mathbf{A}$. Set $f(0, \ldots, 0) = c$. Inductively, we shall define for $0 \leq k \leq m$ polynomials $r_k(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ such that

$$(((\cdots((c \cdot r_1) \cdot r_2)\cdots) \cdot r_{k-1}) \cdot r_k)\,(\bar{0})_S[\bar{x}_S] = f(\bar{0})_S[\bar{x}_S] \qquad (**)$$

for each $S \in [m]^k$ where $\bar{0} = (0, \ldots, 0)$. Set $r_0(\bar{x}) := f(0, \ldots, 0) = c \in A$. For $i \in [m]$, define

$$t_i(x) := c \backslash f(\bar{0})_{\{i\}}[x].$$

Then $t_i(0) = c\backslash f(\bar{0})_{\{i\}}[0] = c\backslash f(\bar{0}) = c\backslash c = 0$; thus, $t_i \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$. Then set $r_1(x_1, \ldots, x_m) := \prod_{i\in[m]} t_i(x_i)$ a left-associated product. We then check $(**)$:

$$(c \cdot r(x_1, \ldots, x_m))\,(\bar{0})_{\{i\}}[x_i] = c \cdot t_i(x_i) = c \cdot (c\backslash f(\bar{0})_{\{i\}}[x_i]) = f(\bar{0})_{\{i\}}[x_i].$$

Inductively, suppose $r_k(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is defined for $k < m$ and satisfies $(**)$. Now for $S \in [m]^{k+1}$, define

$$t_S(\bar{x}_S) := \left((\prod_{i=0}^{k} r_i)(\bar{0})_S[\bar{x}_S] \right) \setminus f(\bar{0})_S[\bar{x}_S]$$

Then for any $i \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} t_S(\bar{x}_S)_i[0] &= \left((\prod_{i=0}^{k} r_i)(\bar{0})_{S\setminus\{i\}}[\bar{x}_{S\setminus\{i\}}] \right) \setminus f(\bar{0})_{S\setminus\{i\}}[\bar{x}_{S\setminus\{i\}}] \\ &= f(\bar{0})_{S\setminus\{i\}}[\bar{x}_{S\setminus\{i\}}] \setminus f(\bar{0})_{S\setminus\{i\}}[\bar{x}_{S\setminus\{i\}}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

using the inductive hypothesis. This shows $t_S(\bar{x}_S) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^{k+1} \mathbf{A}$. Then define the left-associated product $r_{k+1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m) := \prod_{S\in[m]^{k+1}} t_S(\bar{x}_S)$ and check $(**)$: fix $T \in [m]^{k+1}$

and calculate

$$\begin{aligned}(\prod_{i=0}^{k+1} r_i)(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T] &= \left((\prod_{i=0}^{k} r_i)(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T]\right) \cdot t_T(\bar{x}_T) \\ &= \left((\prod_{i=0}^{k} r_i)(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T]\right) \cdot \left(\left((\prod_{i=0}^{k} r_i)(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T]\right) \setminus f(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T]\right) \\ &= f(\bar{0})_T[\bar{x}_T].\end{aligned}$$

Now for $k = m$, note $r_i(\bar{0})_{[m]}[\bar{x}_{[m]}] = r_i(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ when $i \leq m$. So by $(**)$ we have for the left-associated product

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{i=0}^{m} r_i(x_1, \ldots, x_m) &= \left(\prod_{i=0}^{m-1} r_i(x_1, \ldots, x_m)\right) \cdot \left(\left(\prod_{i=0}^{m-1} r_i(x_1, \ldots, x_m)\right) \setminus f(x_1, \ldots, x_m)\right) \\ &= f(x_1, \ldots, x_m).\end{aligned}$$

Since A is n-supernilpotent, by Lemma 3.2 $t_S(\bar{x}_S) = \hat{0}$ for $S \in [m]^k$ with $k \geq n$; thus, $r_k(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \hat{0}$ for $k \geq n$. This reduces the representation above to

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \prod_{i=0}^{p} r_i(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

where $p = \min\{m, n-1\}$. Altogether, we have established that $\mathbf{A}$ has a representation of degree n-1.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent. Again we have that $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to a loop $\mathbf{L}_A = \langle A, \cdot, \setminus, /, 0, F\rangle$ which is nilpotent of class n-1. Condition 3.3(3) is established by using (HC8). To show 3.3(2), let $f \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^{n-1}\mathbf{A}$ and define

$$f'(y, z, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) := \left(f(y \cdot z, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) / f(z, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1})\right) / f(y, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}).$$

Then $f' \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^n \mathbf{A}$ and so by Lemma 3.2, $f' = \hat{0}$; thus,

$$f(y \cdot z, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = f(y, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \cdot f(z, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}).$$

Inductively, we have for a left associated product $\prod_{i=1}^{m} y_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}f(\prod_{i=1}^{m} y_i, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) &= f(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} y_i, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \cdot f(y_m, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{m} f(y_i, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1})\end{aligned}$$

which is again left-associated. The same argument works for each coordinate. This establishes 3.3(2). From the implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) above, we have a representation of degree n-1 for $\mathbf{A}$. This implies we can take $F' = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A} \subseteq F$ in order to generate $\mathrm{Pol}\,\mathbf{A}$ and so condition 3.3(1) is satisfied.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to an n-type loop $\mathbf{L} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$. So $\mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{A} = \mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{L}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and both $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ are nilpotent of class n-1. Let P_k denote the set of polynomials $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{L}$ which can be represented in the form of Definition 3.6 for n-1; clearly, $P_k \subseteq \mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{L}$. We shall establish $\mathrm{Pol}_k \mathbf{L} \subseteq P_k$ by showing that P_k contains the constants, projections and is closed under the fundamental operations of $\mathbf{L}$. That P_k contains the constants and projections is immediate. For the binary operations $\cdot, \backslash, /$ the proof in (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) works again here to allow us to "solve" for the representations. The more involved argument is closure under F.

Fix $f \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{L} \subseteq F$. Take $g_1, \dots, g_k \in P_k$. We need to show $f(g_1, \dots, g_m) \in P_k$. Since each $g_i \in P_k$, we can write a left-associated product $g_i = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} r_j^i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. By Lemma 3.5, $f(g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is a product (associated in some manner) of absorbing polynomials $h(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_p)$ where $h \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^p \mathbf{L}$ for $m \leq p \leq n-1$ and $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_p\} \subseteq \{r_j^i : i \in [m], 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$. Another application of Lemma 3.5 allows us to write each $h(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_p)$ as a product (associated in some manner) of absorbing polynomials $h'(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q)$ with $h' \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^q \mathbf{L}$ for $m \leq p \leq q \leq n-1$ and $\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q\} \subseteq \{t_S^i(\bar{x}_S) : i \in [m], S \in [k]^j, 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$ where the last set comprises all the absorbing polynomials which appear in the products representing the r_j^i's.

Since each $\zeta_i \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^{j_i} \mathbf{L}$, we have $h'(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^\sigma \mathbf{L}$ for some $\sigma \leq k^* = j_1 + \cdots + j_q$ since the ζ_i may have variables in common. According to Lemma 3.4, we see that $h'(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q) = \hat{0}$ unless $k^* \leq n-1$. This just means each non-trivial $h'(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q) \in P_k$. Since P_k is closed under $\cdot$ and we have shown $f(g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is a finite product of absorbing polynomials with representations in P_k, it follows that P_k is closed under the operations in F.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent and has a representation of degree $n-1$. We first show $\mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A} = \{\hat{0}\}$ where $k \geq n$. Let $f \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A}$. Then we can write

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = ((\cdots((c \cdot r_1) \cdot r_2) \cdots) \cdot r_{n-2}) \cdot r_{n-1}$$

where $r_m(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{s \in [k]^{(m)}} t_s^m(\bar{x}_s)$ is a left-associated product with $t_s^m(\bar{x}_s) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{A}$. Using that f is 0-absorbing, we see that $0 = f(0, \dots, 0) = c$, and so $0 = f(\bar{x})_{[n]\setminus\{i\}}[0] = t_i(x_i)$ for each $i \in [n]$. This shows $r_1(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \hat{0}$. Continuing in this fashion, having established $r_m(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \hat{0}$ we see that $0 = f(\bar{x})_{[n]\setminus s}[0, \dots, 0] = t_s^{m+1}(\bar{x}_s)$ for each $s \in [k]^{(m+1)}$ and so we have $r_{m+1}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \hat{0}$. Inductively, we have shown $f = \hat{0}$.

Now let $g \in \mathrm{Pol}_n \mathbf{A}$ and suppose g absorbs $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ to a. We will show $g = \hat{a}$. It will then follow from [1, Prop.6.16] that the n-commutator $[1, \dots, 1] = 0_A$ and so $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent. Since $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent, for each $i \in [n]$ the unary polynomial $h_i(x) := m(x, 0, a_i)$ is bijective. Define the polynomial

$$t(x_1, \dots, x_n) := m(g(h_1(x_1), \dots, h_n(x_n)), a, 0).$$

Then $t \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^n \mathbf{A}$ and so $t = \hat{0}$ be the previous paragraph. Again, the unary polynomial $m(x, a, 0)$ is bijective by nilpotence. Then for all $b_1, \dots, b_n \in A$, the evaluation

$$m(g(h_1(b_1), \dots, h_n(b_n)), a, 0) = t(b_1, \dots, b_n) = 0 = m(a, a, 0)$$

implies $g(h_1(b_1), \dots, h_n(b_n)) = a$. So $g(h_1(x_1), \dots, h_n(x_n)) = \hat{a}$. Since each h_i is bijective, it must be that $g = \hat{a}$. •

3.1. **Abelian and 3-Supernilpotent.** We note how to derive the affine structure of abelian algebras and the characterization of 3-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras [13, Thm.3.3] from Theorem 3.8 and general considerations of terms in loops. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be algebra with Mal'cev term $m(x, y, z)$ and fix $0 \in A$. We can always make the following definitions:

- $x \cdot y := m(x, 0, y) \quad (\forall x, y \in A)$;
- $(t \cdot s)(\bar{x}) := m(t(\bar{x}), 0, s(\bar{x})) \quad (\forall t, s \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A})$;
- $(t \circ s)(x_1, \dots, x_k) := t(s(x_1, \dots, x_k), x_2, \dots, x_k) \quad (\forall t, s \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A})$;
- $t * a := t(a) \quad (\forall t \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \forall a \in A)$.

Direct from the definitions we always have:

- $0 \cdot x = x \cdot 0 = 0 \quad (\forall x \in A)$;
- $(t \cdot s) \circ r = (t \circ r) \cdot (s \circ r) \quad (\forall t, s, r \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A})$;
- $(t \cdot s) * a = (t \circ a) \cdot (s \circ a) \quad (\forall t \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \forall a \in A)$.

Additional properties depend on the behavior of the absorbing polynomials and the loop structure induced by nilpotence.

Now fix a loop $\mathbf{L} = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0 \rangle$. It follows from the loop identities that for any $a \in A$ the maps

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x & \mapsto & a \cdot x & \qquad x \mapsto a \backslash x \\ x & \mapsto & x \cdot a & \qquad x \mapsto a / x \end{array}$$

are permutations on A. We can then define several terms which in some manner "measure" the failure of the operation $\cdot$ to be commutative or associative. Define the terms $[x, y], [x^{-1}, y^{-1}]$ and $[y^{-1}, x]$ as the unique solutions to the equations

$$xy \approx [x, y] \cdot (yx) \ , \quad xy \approx (yx) \cdot [x^{-1}, y^{-1}] \ , \quad xy \approx y \cdot ([y^{-1}, x] \cdot x).$$

Define the terms $a_1(x, y, z)$ and $a_2(x, y, z)$ as the unique solutions to the equations

$$(xy)z \approx x((yz) \cdot a_1(x, y, z)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (xy)z \approx (x(yz)) \cdot a_2(x, y, z).$$

For a polynomial $t \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{L}$, we can define $d_t(x, y)$ as the solution to

$$t(x \cdot y) = (t(x) \cdot t(y)) \cdot d_t(x, y).$$

We can actually solve for the terms defined above; for example,

$$[y^{-1}, x] = (y \backslash (xy))/x \ , \quad a_1(x, y, z) = (yz) \backslash (x \backslash ((xy)z)) \ , \quad d_t(x, y) = (t(x) \cdot t(y)) \backslash t(x \cdot y).$$

By direct calculation, it is easy to see the following:

Lemma 3.9. We have

(1) $[x, y], [x^{-1}, y^{-1}], [y^{-1}, x], d_t(x, y) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{L}$,
(2) $a_1(x, y, z), a_2(x, y, z) \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^3 \mathbf{L}$.

Several other terms can be defined in a similar manner, and all are easily seen to be absorbing polynomials and can claim to "measure" the lack of associativity, commutativity or distributivity of unary absorbing polynomials.

Example 3.10. Suppose $\mathbf{A}$ is an abelian Mal'cev algebra. Then from Theorem 3.8, $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to a 2-type loop $\mathbf{L}_A = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ which determines a degree 1 representation

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = c \cdot r_1 = c \cdot ((\cdots (t_1(x_1) \cdot t_2(x_2)) \cdots) \cdot t_n(x_n))$$

for $f \in \operatorname{Pol}_n \mathbf{A}$. The operations of $\mathbf{L}_A$ induce a loop structure $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0}\right\rangle$. Since $\mathbf{A}$ is abelian, $\operatorname{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A} = \{\hat{0}\}$ for $k \geq 2$. Then associativity and commutativity of "$\cdot$" follows since all the terms in Lemma 3.9 are trivial; thus, the loop structures are term equivalent to abelian groups $\langle A, +, -, 0\rangle$ and $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle$ where $-x = x\backslash 0 = 0/x$. Again, $d_t(x, y) = \hat{0}$ implies distributivity of "$\circ$" and "$*$" over "$+$", so $\mathbf{R}_A = \left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, +, -, 0, \circ\right\rangle$ is a ring and "$*$" makes $\langle A, +, -, 0\rangle$ into a $\mathbf{R}_A$-module where the degree 1 representation explicitly describes the module polynomials.

Example 3.11. Suppose $\mathbf{A}$ is a 3-supernilotent Mal'cev algebra. Then $\operatorname{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A} = \{\hat{0}\}$ for $k \geq 3$. From Theorem 3.8, $\mathbf{A}$ is polynomially equivalent to a 3-type loop $\mathbf{L}_A = \langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, F\rangle$ where $F = \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A} \cup \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$. The operations of $\mathbf{L}_A$ define loop structures $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0}\right\rangle$ and $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0}\right\rangle$. We no longer have commutativity, but associativity of "$\cdot$" follows from $a_1(x, y, z) = \hat{0}$; therefore, the loops $\langle A, \cdot, \backslash, /, 0, \rangle$ and $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0}\right\rangle$ are term equivalent to the groups $\langle A, \cdot, ^{-1}, 0\rangle$ and $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0}\right\rangle$. Then the expanded group $\langle A, \cdot, ^{-1}, 0, F\rangle$ is of the type in [13, Thm 3.3] by Theorem 3.8(3).

There is additional structure. Since we always have right-distributivity, the structure $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, +, ^{-1}, \hat{0}, \circ\right\rangle$ is a right-nearring. For $f, g \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$, $([f(x, y), g(x, y)], 0) \in [[1, 1], [1, 1]] = 0_A$ for all $x, y \in A$ which implies $[f, g] = \hat{0}$; thus, together with $a_1(x, y, z) = \hat{0}$ we see that the loop $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0}\right\rangle$ of binary absorbing polynomials is term equivalent to the abelian group $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle$. Note the composition "$\circ$" is trivial in $\operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$.

For $f \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$, $t \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$, we can define two pairings $(t * f)(x, y) := t(f(x, y))$ and $(t \otimes f)(x, y) = f(t(x), y)$. For $f, g \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$ and $t \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$, we see that $d_t(f, g) = \hat{0}$ which implies that the pairing $(t * f)(x, y) := t(f(x, y))$ determines an action of the right-nearring $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0}, \circ\right\rangle$ on the abelian group $\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle$. For fixed $t \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}$, the action implies the map $\operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A} \ni f \longmapsto \phi_t(f) = t * f \in \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}$ is an endomorphism of the abelian group; therefore, $\phi_t \in \operatorname{End}(\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle)$ which is naturally a right-nearring under addition and composition of endomorphisms. Then the map $t \longmapsto \phi_t : \left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0}, \circ\right\rangle \to \operatorname{End}(\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle)$ is a right-nearring homomorphism.

Similarly, if we define $\psi_t(f) = t \otimes f$, then distributivity of the binary absorbing polynomials over "$\cdot$" implies $t \longmapsto \psi_t : \left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0}, \circ\right\rangle \to \operatorname{End}(\left\langle \operatorname{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0}\right\rangle)$ is also a right-nearring homomorphism.

Incidentally, we can reverse the pairings by defining $\alpha_f(t) = \phi_t(f)$ and $\beta_f(t) = \pi_t(f)$. Then we have group homomorphisms

$$f \longmapsto \alpha_f : \left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0} \right\rangle \to \mathrm{Hom}(\left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0} \right\rangle, \left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0} \right\rangle),$$
$$f \longmapsto \beta_f : \left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0} \right\rangle \to \mathrm{Hom}(\left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^1 \mathbf{A}, \cdot, ^{-1}, \hat{0} \right\rangle, \left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^2 \mathbf{A}, +, -, \hat{0} \right\rangle).$$

The last example highlights a more general calculation. Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is a n-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebra. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{A}_k = \left\langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^k \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \hat{0} \right\rangle$ denote the algebra of k-ary absorbing polynomial with the loop operations induced by $\mathbf{L}_A$. Since $\mathbf{A}$ is n-supernilpotent, $\mathbf{A}_k$ is trivial for $k \geq n$. Using the degree n-1 representation of $\mathbf{A}$ in Theorem 3.8(2), we see that in general $\mathbf{A}_k$ is n-(k-1)-supernilpotent for $1 \leq k < n$, but we can say more; for $\left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \leq k < n$, $\mathbf{A}_k$ is term equivalent to a group, and for $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \leq k < n$ it is abelian.

For $t \in \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{A}$ define the maps $\phi_t, \psi_t : \mathbf{A}_k \to \mathbf{A}_{\max\{k,m\}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t(f) &= (t \circ f)(x_1, \ldots, x_{\max\{k,m\}}) = t(f(x_1, \ldots, x_k), x_2, \ldots, x_m) \\ \psi_t(f) &= (f \circ t)(x_1, \ldots, x_{\max\{k,m\}}) = f(t(x_1, \ldots, x_m), x_2, \ldots, x_k). \end{aligned}$$

Calculating as in Example 3.11, we have the following properties:

(1) Assume $m + 2k - 1 \geq n$ and $k \geq m$;
   (a) If $\left\lceil \frac{n}{3} \right\rceil \leq k < n$, then $\phi_t \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbf{A}_k)$;
   (b) If $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \leq k < n$, then $t \mapsto \phi_t : \langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \circ \rangle \to \mathrm{End}(\mathbf{A}_k)$ is a right-nearring homomorphism;

(2) For all $1 \leq m, k < n$, $\psi_t \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbf{A}_k)$;
   (a) Assume $k \geq m$. If $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \leq k < n$ and $2m+k-1$, then $t \mapsto \psi_t : \langle \mathrm{Ab}_0^m \mathbf{A}, \cdot, \backslash, /, \circ \rangle \to \mathrm{End}(\mathbf{A}_k)$ is a right-nearring homomorphism;

(3) If $m > k$, then $\psi_t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{A}_m)$
   (a) If $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \leq m < n$, then for $1 \leq k < n$, the map $t \mapsto \psi_t : \mathbf{A}_m \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{A}_m)$ is a group homomorphism;
   (b) If $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil \leq m < n$ and $2k + m - 1 \geq n$, then $t \mapsto \phi_t : \mathbf{A}_m \to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{A}_m)$ is a group homomorphism.

These actions and homomorphisms suggest the following meta-problem: to what extant does the sequence of derived loops $\mathbf{L}_A, \mathbf{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_{n-1}$ play a role in understanding the structure of the n-supernilpotent Mal'cev algebra $\mathbf{A}$.

4. Neutrality

The n-commutator is *neutral* in an algebra $\mathbf{A}$ if $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] = \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n$ for all $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq \mathrm{Con}\,\mathbf{A}$. For a variety $\mathcal{V}$, the n-commutator is said to be neutral if it is neutral in every algebra in the variety. The next lemma is a standard result for the binary commutator in arbitrary varieties and can be argued in exactly the same manner for the higher commutators.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety. The following are equivalent:

(1) $\underbrace{[\theta(x,y),\dots,\theta(x,y)]}_{n} < \theta(x,y)$ in $\operatorname{Con}\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$;

(2) $\mathcal{V}$ contains an algebra with a proper n-supernilpotent interval in its congruence lattice.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose $\mathbf{A}$ is a Mal'cev algebra and (α,β) is an n-supernilpotent interval in $\operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$. Then for every cover $\alpha \le \gamma \prec \sigma \le \beta$, (γ,σ) is an abelian interval.

Proof: By assumption, $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\beta,\dots,\beta;\alpha)$ and so $[\sigma,\dots,\sigma] \le [\beta,\dots,\beta] \le \alpha \le \gamma$ by (HC2). Then by (HC5) we have $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\sigma,\dots,\sigma;\gamma)$ and so $\mathbf{A}/\gamma \vDash C(\sigma/\gamma,\dots,\sigma/\gamma;0_{A/\gamma})$. Note $0_{A/\gamma} \prec \sigma/\gamma$. Then using (HC8),

$$[\sigma/\gamma,\underbrace{[\sigma/\gamma,\cdots,[\sigma/\gamma,\sigma/\gamma]}_{n-1}\cdots]] \le \underbrace{[\sigma/\gamma,\dots,\sigma/\gamma]}_{n} = 0_{A/\gamma} \le \underbrace{[\sigma/\gamma,\dots,\sigma/\gamma]}_{k} \le \sigma/\gamma$$

for $2 \le k < n$ implies $[\sigma/\gamma,\sigma/\gamma] = 0_{A/\gamma}$. Then we must have $\mathbf{A}/\gamma \vDash C(\sigma/\gamma,\sigma/\gamma;0_{A/\gamma})$ which implies $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\sigma,\sigma;\gamma)$ by Lemma 2.2(4). •

If we no longer assume $\mathbf{A}$ has a Mal'cev term but is a finite algebra, then we can still conclude every cover in a supernilpotent interval is abelian.

Proposition 4.3. Suppose $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra and (α,β) a supernilpotent interval in $\operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$. Then every cover $\alpha \prec \sigma \prec \gamma \le \beta$ is abelian.

Proof: Suppose (α,β) is a n-supernilpotent interval in $\operatorname{Con}\mathbf{A}$ and $\alpha \le \sigma \prec \gamma \le \beta$. Then $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\underbrace{\gamma,\dots,\gamma}_{n};\alpha)$ since $\gamma \le \beta$. In the language of tame congruence theory [6], we shall show $\operatorname{type}(\sigma,\gamma) \in \{1,2\}$.

For a contradiction, assume $\operatorname{type}(\sigma,\gamma) \in \{3,4,5\}$. Fix a minimal set $U \in M(\sigma,\gamma)$ and its unique trace N. If $\operatorname{type}(\sigma,\gamma) \in \{3,4\}$, then $\mathbf{A}_N = \langle\{0,1\},(\operatorname{Pol}\mathbf{A})_N\rangle$ with $(0,1) \in \gamma-\sigma$ and $\mathbf{A}_N$ polynomially equivalent to either a Boolean algebra (type 3) or a lattice (type 4). If $\operatorname{type}(\sigma,\gamma) = 5$, then $N/\sigma = \{0/\sigma,1/\sigma\}$ for two elements $\{0,1\} \subseteq A$ and $\mathbf{A}/\sigma_{N/\sigma}$ is polynomially equivalent to a semilattice with $1/\sigma = \{1\}$ and minimal element $\bot = 0/\sigma$; in addition, for any $a \in 0/\sigma$ there is a polynomial t such that $\left\langle\{a,1\}, t\restriction_{\{a,1\}}\right\rangle$ is a semilattice with minimal element $\bot = a$.

In all cases, we can find a polynomial t of $\mathbf{A}$ and two elements $\{0,1\}$ such that $(0,1) \in \gamma - \sigma$ and t restricted to $\{0,1\}$ is a semilattice operation with minimal element $\bot = 0$. Define the polynomial $h(x_1,\dots,x_n) = t(x_1,t(x_2,\cdots,t(x_{n-1},x_n)\cdots))$. Using the semilattice identities, for all $\bar{u} \in \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}\{0,1\} \setminus \{1,\dots,1\}$ we see that $h(\bar{u},0) = 0 = h(\bar{u},1)$ because some coordinate in $\bar{u}$ is 0. Since h is still a polynomial of $\mathbf{A}$ we conclude that $0 = h(1,\dots,1,0)\,\underbrace{[\gamma,\dots,\gamma]}_{n}\,h(1,\dots,1,1) = 1$; thus, $(0,1) \in \underbrace{[\gamma,\dots,\gamma]}_{n} \le \alpha \le \sigma$, a contradiction. It must be that $\operatorname{type}(\sigma,\gamma) \in \{1,2\}$. •

Corollary 4.4. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra. Every supernilpotent congruence is solvable; consequently, if $\mathbf{A}$ is a supernilpotent Taylor algebra, then $\mathbf{A}$ is a nilpotent Mal'cev algebra.

Proof: Assume $\mathbf{A}$ is a finite algebra and $\alpha \in \operatorname{Con} A$ is a supernilpotent congruence for some $n \geq 2$. Then by Proposition 4.3, $\mathbf{A} \vDash C(\alpha, \alpha; \sigma)$ for all co-atoms $\sigma \prec \alpha$; thus, $[\alpha, \alpha] \leq \bigwedge_{\sigma \prec 1} \sigma < \alpha$. Since $(0, [\alpha, \alpha])$ is also a supernilpotent interval, Proposition 4.3 again shows $[[\alpha, \alpha], [\alpha, \alpha]] \leq \bigwedge_{0 \leq \sigma \prec [\alpha, \alpha]} \sigma < [\alpha, \alpha]$ provided $[\alpha, \alpha] \neq 0$. If we define $[\alpha]^0 = \alpha$ and $[\alpha]^{k+1} = [[\alpha]^k, [\alpha]^k]$, then inductively we have a descending series $\alpha > [\alpha, \alpha] > [\alpha]^2 > \cdots$. Since $\mathbf{A}$ is finite, some $[\alpha]^k = 0$ which shows α is solvable.

If $\mathbf{A}$ is a Taylor algebra and supernilpotent, then the first part applied to 1_A shows $\mathbf{A}$ is solvable. According to [6, Thm.9.6], $\mathbf{A}$ interprets a Mal'cev term; thus, $\mathbf{A}$ is nilpotent because it is a supernilpotent Mal'cev algebra. •

Theorem 4.5. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety in which the 2-generated free algebra $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ is finite. The following are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence meet-semidistributive;
(2) $\mathcal{V}$ is n-commutator neutral for all $n \geq 2$;
(3) $\mathcal{V}$ is n-commutator neutral for some $n \geq 2$.

Proof: We show (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Suppose $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence meet-semidistributive but there exists $n > 2$ and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \operatorname{Con} \mathbf{A}$ such that $[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] < \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n$. Set $\beta = \alpha_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \alpha_n$ and note $[\beta, \ldots, \beta] < \beta$; thus, $([\beta, \ldots, \beta], \beta)$ is an n-supernilpotent interval in $\operatorname{Con} \mathbf{A}$. By Lemma 4.1, $([\theta, \ldots, \theta], \theta)$ is a nontrivial n-supernilpotent interval in $\operatorname{Con} \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ where $\theta = \theta(x, y)$. Since $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ is finite, we can find an n-supernilpotent cover $[\theta, \ldots, \theta] \prec \gamma \leq \theta$. By Proposition 4.3, $[\theta, \ldots, \theta] \prec \gamma$ is an abelian cover, but this cannot occur in a congruence meet-semidistributive variety [10, Cor.4.7]; therefore, every n-commutator is neutral in $\mathcal{V}$.

The implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is trivial.

We now show (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Assume the n-commutator is neutral for some $n \geq 2$. If $n > 2$, then for any $\alpha, \beta \in \operatorname{Con} \mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\alpha \wedge \beta = [\underbrace{\alpha, \ldots, \alpha}_{n-1}, \beta] \leq [\alpha, \beta] \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$$

shows the binary commutator is neutral and so $\mathcal{V}$ is congruence meet-semidistributive [10, Cor.4.7]. •

We conjecture the characterization holds without additional assumptions of finiteness in the variety.

Conjecture 4.6. A variety is congruence meet-semidistributive if and only if all the higher commutators are neutral.

For locally finite varieties, tame congruence theory characterizes Taylor varieties by the existence of an idempotent ternary term which interprets as a Mal'cev operation on the blocks of any locally solvable congruence [6, Thm.9.6]; consequently, using [9] we can see

that a locally finite variety is Taylor if and only if the abelian algebras are affine. Without any assumption of finiteness, the class of varieties for which the abelian algebras are affine form a proper subclass of Taylor varieties. A *weak difference* term for a variety $\mathcal{V}$ is a term $c(x, y, z)$ such that for all $a, b \in \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ we have

$$c(a, b, b)\, [\theta, \theta]\, a\, [\theta, \theta]\, c(b, b, a)$$

where $\theta = \theta(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}$. For an algebras A and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \operatorname{Con} A$, recursively define congruences in the following manner: $\beta_0 = \beta$, $\gamma_0 = \gamma$ and $\gamma_{k+1} = \gamma \vee (\alpha \wedge \beta_k)$, $\beta_{k+1} = \beta \vee (\alpha \wedge \gamma_k)$.

Theorem 4.7. [10, Thm.4.8] Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety. The following conditions are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{V}$ has a weak difference term;
(2) $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the congruence inclusion $\alpha \wedge (\beta \circ \gamma) \subseteq \gamma_n \circ \beta_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(3) $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies an idempotent Mal'cev condition which is strong enough to imply that abelian algebras are affine.

An explicit presentation of the Mal'cev condition for varieties with a weak difference term can be derived in the standard way from the congruence inclusion stated in Theorem 4.7(2).

In light of Theorem 3.8, it is reasonable to conjecture that the class of varieties in which the n-supernilpotent algebras are polynomially equivalent to n-type loops determines a Mal'cev condition - it is easy to see that such varieties have a weak difference term. We shall show that for locally finite varieties the two classes are equivalent. A *weak n-difference* term for a variety $\mathcal{V}$ is a term $p(x, y, z)$ such that for all $a, b \in \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ we have

$$p(a, b, b)\ \underbrace{[\theta, \ldots, \theta]}_{n}\ a\ \underbrace{[\theta, \ldots, \theta]}_{n}\ p(b, b, a).$$

where $\theta = \theta(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}$.

Theorem 4.8. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety such that $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ is finite. The following conditions are equivalent:

(1) $\mathcal{V}$ has a term $c(x, y, z)$ which is an weak n-difference term for all $n \geq 2$;
(2) $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies an idempotent Mal'cev condition which is strong enough to imply that for all $n \geq 2$, n-supernilpotent algebras are polynomially equivalent to an n-type loop;
(3) $\mathcal{V}$ has a weak difference term.

`Proof`: Consider the statement

(2)′: $\mathcal{V}$ has an idempotent term which interprets as a Mal'cev operation in every block of a supernilpotent congruence.

From Theorem 3.8, it is enough to show (1) and (3) are equivalent to (2)′. The Mal'cev condition in (2) is then the one given by Theorem 4.7(2).

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)′: A weak n-difference term must be idempotent because $\theta(a, a) = 0$. Since the n-commutator $[\theta, \ldots, \theta] = 0$ in a n-supernilpotent algebra, the weak n-difference term satisfies the Mal'cev identities.

$(2)' \Rightarrow (3)$: Let $c(x, y, z)$ be an idempotent term which interprets as a Mal'cev operation in every block of a supernilpotent congruence. Let θ be a congruence of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $(a, b) \in \theta$. If $\theta = [\theta, \theta]$, then $c(b, b, a)[\theta, \theta]a[\theta, \theta]c(a, b, b)$ because c is idempotent. In case $[\theta, \theta] < \theta$, we factor by $[\theta, \theta]$ and observe that $\theta/[\theta, \theta]$ is an abelian congruence in $\mathbf{A}/[\theta, \theta]$.Then $c(a, b, b)/[\theta, \theta] = a/[\theta, \theta] = c(b, b, a)/[\theta, \theta]$. It follows that $c(x, y, z)$ is a weak difference for $\mathcal{V}$.

$(3) \Rightarrow (1)$: If $\mathcal{V}$ has no supernilpotent algebra, then it is congruence meet-semidistributive by Theorem 4.5 and so the n-commutators are all neutral. The third projection term will then serve as the required n-difference term. We may assume $\mathcal{V}$ contains nontrivial supernilpotent algebras. If we take $n > 2$, then by Lemma 4.1, $([\theta, \ldots, \theta], \theta)$ is a proper n-supernilpotent interval where $\theta = \theta(x, y) \in \operatorname{Con} \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$. The free algebra $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ is Taylor because it is finite and contained in a variety with a weak difference term; therefore, there is an idempotent term $c(x, y, z)$ in the subvariety $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)) \leq \mathcal{V}$ which interprets as a Mal'cev operation in every block of a solvable congruence in the subvariety [6, Thm.9.6]. Since $\theta/[\theta, \ldots, \theta]$ is a supernilpotent congruence in $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)/[\theta, \ldots, \theta]$, by Corollary 4.4 it is solvable. Then $c(x, y, y)/[\theta, \ldots, \theta] = x/[\theta, \ldots, \theta] = c(y, y, x)/[\theta, \ldots, \theta]$ because $(x/[\theta, \ldots, \theta], y/[\theta, \ldots, \theta]) \in \theta/[\theta, \ldots, \theta]$. This shows c is a weak n-difference term for $\mathcal{V}$. •

Conjecture 4.9. Theorem 4.8 is true without the assumption that $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$ is finite.

Acknowledgments 4.10. I would like to thank Andrew Moorhead and Jakub Opršal for intriguing and enthusiastic discussions related to the topic of this paper during the Vanderbilt Workshop on Structure and Complexity in Universal Algebra held September 19 - 30, 2016 in Nashville TN.

References

[1] E. Aichinger, N. Mudrinski: *Some Applications of Higher Commutators for Mal'cev Algebras*. Algebra Universalis **63**:367-403, (2010)

[2] C. Bergman, *Universal Algebra: Fundamentals and Selected Topics* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, Fl, 2012).

[3] A. Bulatov *On the number of finite Mal'tsev algebras*, Contr. Gen. Alg. 13, Proceedings of the Dresden Conference 2000 (AAA 60) and the Summer School 1999, Verlag Johannes Heyn, Klagenfurt, 41-54, (2001)

[4] Burris, S., Sankappanavar, H.P.: A Course in Universal Algebra. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol.78, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1981.

[5] R. Freese, R. McKenzie *Commutator Theory in Congruence Modular Varieties*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes 125, (1987)

[6] D. Hobby, and R. McKenzie, *The Structure of Finite Algebras*, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol 76, (AMS, Providence, RI, 1988).

[7] H. P. Gumm, *Geometrical methods in congruence modular algebras*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc., (1983).
[8] J. Hagemann and C. Herrmann: *A concrete ideal multiplication for algebraic systems and its relation to congruence distributivity*. Arch. Math. (Basel) **32**:234245, (1979)
[9] C. Herrmann: *Affine algebras in congruence modular varieties*. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **41**:119-125, (1979)
[10] K. Kearnes, A. Szendrei: *The Relationship Between Two Commutators*. Inter. J. of Algebra and Comp. **9**:497-531, (1998)
[11] K. Kearnes, E. Kiss: *The Shape of Congruence Lattices*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **222**,no. 1046: viii-169pp, (2013)
[12] A. Moorhead: *Higher Commutator Theory for Congruence Modular Varieties*. arXiv:1610.07087v1 [math.LO] (2016)
[13] N. Mudrinski: *2-Supernilpotent Mal'cev algebras*. Monatsh Math **172**:161-166, (2013)
[14] J. Opršal: *A Relational Description of Higher Commutators in Mal'cev Varieties*. arXiv:1412.5776 [math.RA] (2014)
[15] J. D. H. Smith, *Malcev varieties*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics,vol. 554, Berlin, (1976).

School of Economic Mathematics, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, 555 Liutai Avenue, Wenjiang District, Chengdu 611130, Sichuan, China
E-mail address: awires@swufe.edu.cn